

chapter residents about knowing the law, understanding the law, respecting the law and to encourage others to maintain respect for laws within their chapter areas. A special legal educational leaflet has been prepared for local residents to understand and know the necessary agreements they make when they sign a conditional sales contract, to buy furnitures, appliances or automobiles. The residents are also informed in Navajo that they must have the contract explained to them in detail, so they can understand and know the figures of the financial negotiations very plainly before they sign the contract.

Oral presentations are made to residents that they must know the federal and tribal laws that regulate the traders, who have stores and deal with Navajos on the Navajo Reservation. A legal educational leaflet is being prepared for the public, which explains in simple English the tribal and federal laws that apply to trading posts.

All DNA staff attorneys, counselors and interpreters/investigators have attended two OEO legal services conferences where they were informed about consumer laws, consumer fraud, consumer lawsuits, consumer counseling, consumer practices, and consumer education. The purpose for the DNA staff attending these conferences was to acquire more knowledge about consumer laws, so the staff can better understand and effectively serve DNA clients. DNA staff members who attended these conferences also talked to many conference participants about DNA's legal services, preventive law, community consumer education programs, and exchanged ideas on the types of legal cases processed on the reservation and other programs. DNA education staff talked to tribal fair visitors about DNA's preventive law and community education program, showed legal educational films, slide pictures, played tape recordings on legal educational program, handed out educational brochures and distributed information on the activities of DNA legal services program to thousands of residents and visitors at the Navajo Tribal Fair.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I sent an amendment to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 4, line 20, it is proposed to add at the end thereof the following:

"Provided, that no part of any such funds shall be used to make any payment to any lawyer during the period that he is disbarred or suspended from the practice of law;".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have one question to ask of the Senator from Iowa. Is the understanding that such a lawyer shall not be employed in any way in the legal services program?

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That is the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I see no objection to it, though I know of no such case, and, so far as I know, neither does the OEO. I ask the Senator if he can tell us of one. I am not saying that challengingly, but apparently he does not know of any. However, it is a precautionary measure, and I would have no objection to it.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues. I make the observation that the legal services activity is a comparatively new one and there is a great deal of hope for its future. I feel strongly that we must make sure nothing is done that will impede it. I believe the amendment will satisfy the desire of a great many people who are concerned about such a thing happening.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. I have no objection to the Senator's amendment. The one problem I have is this: Suppose there is a State which unfairly disbars an attorney. Under the amendment of the Senator, would the Senator say that the Director would have authority to review that matter and consider it as a special circumstance? I do not see the likelihood of it, but should that occur, what would happen?

Mr. MILLER. Frankly, I had not thought about that, but it seems to me that if there is such an occurrence—and I can understand how there could be—certainly there should be a way handling it through the Federal courts or through the Civil Liberties Union, which I know takes cases like that.

Mr. MONDALE. In the opinion of the Senator, could the OEO Director take cognizance of that possibility?

Mr. MILLER. Let me say that I would hope the OEO Director in such a case would see to it that a person whom he felt to be unlawfully disbarred was appointed to some other office until such a matter could be taken care of. I do not think that would be a problem.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I move adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

#### EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION AND RADIO AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I call up a privileged matter and ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1242.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1242) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television or radio broadcasting facilities and the provisions relating to support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting which was to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Educational Television and Radio Amendments of 1969".

#### THREE-YEAR AUTHORIZATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FACILITIES

SEC. 2. (a) Section 391 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 391) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the

following new sentence: "There are also authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, \$15,000,000 per fiscal year."

(b) The last sentence of such section is amended by striking out "July 1, 1971" and by inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1974".

#### ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF FINANCING OF CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

SEC. 3. (a) Paragraph (1) of subsection (k) of section 396 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 396) is amended by inserting "and for the next fiscal year the sum of \$20,000,000" after "\$9,000,000".

(b) Paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended by inserting "or the next fiscal year" after "June 30, 1969".

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the pending measure involves the extension of grants for construction of educational television or radio broadcasting facilities and the support for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting created by the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

The bill was passed by the Senate on May 13, 1969. The House made certain perfecting modifications, but the bill is substantially as passed by the Senate.

I would like to point out the modifications made. The Senate provided authorization for a 5-year period for educational facilities, with the general authorization of such sums as may be necessary for each of the next 5 fiscal years.

The House amended that provision by cutting down the 5-year period to 3 years and putting a ceiling on the amount to be authorized of \$15 million for each of the 3 years.

I further want to state that this matter has been taken up by my Republican counterpart on the subcommittee, and it meets with his approval.

I therefore move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3016) to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, to authorize advance funding of such programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which I have already sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments proposed by Mr. DOMINICK are as follows:

On page 4, lines 9 and 10, strike out "7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and".

On page 4, lines 13 and 14, strike out "\$120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and".

On page 4, lines 17 and 18, strike out "\$16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and".

On page 4, lines 21 and 22, strike out "\$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and".

On page 5, lines 1 and 2, strike out "\$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and".

On page 5, lines 6 and 7, strike out "\$1,600,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and".

On page 5, lines 10 and 11, strike out "\$7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and".

On page 5, lines 15 and 16, strike out "\$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and".

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I think I can explain the amendments very quickly.

First of all, I want to say I have enjoyed working on the committee and I have enjoyed working on a bill which I think has a real significance in our national structure.

I was particularly pleased that the committee was willing to take, and did take, the provision that I offered, which gives us, for the first time, a national program for rehabilitation of drug addicts and drug abuses. I think that this will be extremely helpful.

I have had the opportunity of serving on the Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics with the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), and other Senators, studying alcohol and drug abuses. It is apparent that both of these fields need attention, and need national attention. So the effort which was made by the committee to put both the alcoholism and drug programs into the bill are of real significance in the national picture.

With regard to my pending amendment, we have a rather peculiarly structured bill. President Nixon requested \$2.048 billion for OEO in the 1970 fiscal budget. That \$2.048 billion is contained in the bill in total.

The Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) attempted, by his amendment, to strike the earmarking of these funds. He was unsuccessful in that effort. Therefore, the money requested by the administration for OEO for fiscal year 1970 is now tied down.

That \$2.048 billion is not effected by my amendment at all. What we have, in addition to the \$2.048 billion, can be found in the bill, starting on page 4, in line 6, and going through page 5, on line 19. In the committee we referred to this as "add-ons." They are additional authorizations for eight specific programs over and beyond the \$2.048 billion, and in the first year they total \$292.1 million.

My amendment would strike all authorizations for the first year "add-ons."

I know we had extensive testimony in the hearing record indicating that, first of all, the OEO is designed, under its new reorganization plan, to be an innovative agency, not an operating agency. OEO will not operate proven programs on a nationwide basis, but will innovate by way of pilot programs and then, when they are proven, turn them over to existing agencies which would have jurisdiction for actual operation.

The \$292.1 million in this bill is, once again, earmarked for the first year and for the second year. \$292.1 million is added to the \$2.048 billion in fiscal year 1970, at the very time when Congress has put a limit on what the President is allowed to spend in this fiscal year.

So here we go once again, with a law from Congress, passed by both Houses and signed by the President, putting a limit on the maximum amount that he is entitled to spend, and then we go right on from there, as Congress, and authorize the expenditure of a considerable amount of taxpayers' funds, over and beyond the budgetary figures.

Not only do we propose to do that by this bill, unless my amendment is accepted, but we are also doing something which the administration does not want: We are earmarking more money for specific programs, and, in addition to that, authorizing the expenditure of funds which the administration itself has said that it cannot spend fruitfully this year.

Let me state the position we are in. Here we are, in the middle of October. The Appropriations Committee is just starting hearings on the Labor and HEW appropriation bill. It probably will not be marked up, because of a jurisdictional question involved, until late November, and it will probably be about the middle of December before it ever gets to the floor. We have yet to go to conference on whatever the House of Representatives may do on this bill. We are not possibly going to be able to get something into fundamental legal condition for passage and for the President's signature until considerably later this year.

As a result of this situation, we were successful, in committee, after some strenuous arguments, in getting the sponsors of these various amendments to reduce the amounts as originally proposed to one-half for fiscal year 1970. Even so the add-ons total \$292.1 million. What in the world are we doing, authorizing this amount of money, when the agency says it cannot spend it fruitfully, when the administration has said it does not want it, and when we have already put a budgetary limit on the President, limiting what he can spend for this fiscal year?

It seems to me that we are going about it the wrong way, no matter how nice, how pleasant, and how sincere the people are in presenting the need for expanding these programs.

What are the programs? One of them is one I happen to be deeply interested in: the Headstart program. My amendment will not cut back the Headstart program. The fact of the matter is that we have \$338 million for Headstart in the \$2.048 billion which will remain in the bill, so we are not in fact cutting down Headstart at all. As a matter of fact, we are increasing it over last year's estimated expenditures, and over the actual expenditures in 1968, and we are leaving in the very amounts that President Johnson and President Nixon suggested: a total of \$338 million.

So if we strike this from the Headstart program—as I say, I am deeply inter-

ested in that—we will still have \$338 million left in the program as authorized spending for this year. That, I think, is very important to keep in mind. More than that cannot be spent.

And so on, in each one of these programs. For the special impact programs, there is \$46 million in the original bill. As I say, we have \$338 million for Headstart. There is \$58 million for legal services, \$80 million for comprehensive health services, and \$25 million for the emergency food and medical services.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. In a moment, when I finish with this list.

There is \$15 million for family planning programs, \$8,800,000 for senior opportunities, and a lot of other things, including \$34 million for migratory workers, \$12 million for rural loans, \$16 million for administration and coordination, and \$37 million for VISTA.

This amendment would not cut back any of these. They are not affected at all. What I am doing is cutting out the authorization for the add-ons.

I am happy now to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, my question is this: If I understood the Senator correctly, he stated that the Agency, or some of the agencies, would not be able to spend the amount of money that is authorized in the bill if it were appropriated? Is that correct?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct, fruitfully. We had testimony as to that in the hearings.

Mr. NELSON. The biggest add-on of all is the \$240 million for Headstart.

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes. That is for the second year. I am not touching the second year. My amendment would cut only the first year "add-on," which is \$120 million.

Mr. NELSON. So \$120 million is the add-on the first year. Now, in fiscal year 1969, 667,600 children were in Headstart. Under the budget proposed by the administration, with their movement, now, to the year-round Headstart program—on the ground that that is much more effective than the limited summer program—they could handle only 488,100 children. That would mean 179,500 children would have to be dropped from Headstart.

The staff asked the OEO how much money it would take to maintain the same number of children in the Headstart program as are in the Headstart program in fiscal 1969. The OEO gave us the figure of \$240 million. We cut the \$240 million in half for the first year, on the perfectly logical ground that by the time we get the bill passed, something approaching a half year will be gone. So it is perfectly clear that as to the largest add-on, if we are to maintain the 667,700 who are already in the program, we will have to have that money. Is that not correct?

Mr. DOMINICK. No, I do not really think it is, because it is my understanding that the administrative capability is lacking to put together and approve year-round programs for the first year for Headstart, to serve the number of